<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 50-54, 56-63, 65-69 and 72-73 remain in this application, with claims 50, 60 and 68 amended to insert the word "the" in front of "map information," thereby clarifying that the map information referred to is the same information as previously defined by these claims. The amendments are not believed to change the scope of the claims or necessitate any new search.

Claims 50-53, 60-62, 68-69 and 72-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg et al. (US 6,237,006) in view of Bloomberg (US 5,765,176); Claims 54, 56-58, 63 and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Weinberg, Bloomberg and further in view of Astiz (US 6,035,330); and Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg, Bloomberg, Astiz, and further in view of Sitka (US 6,330,572). All of these rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth in the response filed June 4, 2007, and as further explained herein.

The final Office Action mailed August 20, 2007 (hereinafter, the "Final Action") maintained the same rejections and basis for rejections as set forth in the prior Office Action mailed April 2, 2007. In addition, the Final Action included a "Response to Arguments" section, which remarked on the Applicants' response filed June 4, 2007. The present communication responds to those remarks. For the sake of brevity, the text from Applicants' July 4th response is not copied here, but applies with the same force as before.

A. Weinberg & Bloomberg Fail To Disclose *Generating Map Information Including Hyperlinks to Maps of Related Pages*

Claims 50 and 60 define generating map information for the target pages and each set of linked related pages, wherein the map information comprises "hyperlinks referencing the target pages." These claims further require the map information to be "configured such that, when the map information is displayed at a remote client as a

map of a target page, a user can preview information content of the target page and can select ones of the hyperlinks from the map of the target page to receive map information for corresponding ones of the related pages." Weinberg fails to disclose or suggest providing map information for a page with hyperlinks to map information for related pages, wherein the "map information" includes "the block of text, the reduced-size image, hyperlinks referencing the target pages, and a descriptor of selected pages from each set."

On page 8 of the Final Action, it is argued that "Weinberg discloses that hyperlinks referencing target pages and linked related pages are displayed, and upon the selection of one of those hyperlinks a map is generated for the source of the hyperlinked page including in-links and out-links and all map provided information (column 16, lines 20-67 and column 18, lines 20-33 of Weinberg et al.)" This argument errs by ignoring expressly defined features of claims 50 and 60. The display of outgoing links shown in Fig. 6 and discussed at col. 18:20-33 is not map information as defined by claims 50 and 60, because it does not include all of "the block of text, the reduced-size image, hyperlinks referencing the target pages, and a descriptor of selected pages from each set." Fig. 6, as shown and described by Weinberg, is a tree diagram that shows icons connected by lines. It does not include any of the specific map information enumerated by claims 50 and 60. The tree diagram does not include a block of text. It does not include a reduced-size image generated from an image found on a target page. And it does not include a hyperlink.

Simply put, the rejection based on Weinberg rests on a claim construction that is unreasonably broad, in view of the specific features recited by claims 50 and 60.

Therefore, contrary to what is stated in the Office Action, Weinberg does not disclose providing map information "configured such that, when the map information is displayed at a remote client as a map of a target page, a user can preview information content of the target page and can select ones of the hyperlinks from the map of the target page to receive the map information for corresponding ones of the related

12324.1

pages." Bloomberg fails to make up for this deficiency of Weinberg. Bloomberg discloses only text "greeking," and Bloomberg is not concerned with mapping a linked Web site or hyperlinked documents. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case under § 103 has not been properly made out against claims 50 and 60. The remaining claims are also allowable, at least as depending from allowable base claims.

B.   Weinberg & Bloomberg Fail To Disclose *Automatically Selecting Objects Including A Block Of Text And An Image File From Target Objects*

Weinberg is deficient for failing to disclose the elements of (a) automatically selecting "a block of text from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages having text" and "an image file from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages displaying an image;" (b) "generating a reduced-size image from the selected image file;" and (c) "generating map information . . . comprising the block of text, reduced-size image" and other features, as defined by claims 50 and 60.

The "Response to Arguments" provides a plausible explanation for how Weinberg discloses that "non-hyperlink information objects (images, audio files, video files, etc.) are automatically selected for the mapping process (column 8, lines 32-50 of Weinberg et al.)" However, certain features of claims 50 and 60 continue to be overlooked. Weinberg does not disclose generating a reduced size image, or generating map information including the reduced size image. These deficiencies of Weinberg are not disputed.

Bloomberg does not make up for these deficiencies of Weinberg. Bloomberg merely discloses providing iconic rectangular blocks of illegible "greeked text," as in a thumbnail image, for documents in a database. Col. 5, line 63 — col. 6, line 24. The text itself is not provided; just a graphical representation of text. Fig. 3; col. 11, lines 5-7. If the original text is large enough, for example, heading text, the reduced-size image may be legible, but for normal-size original text, the reduced size image is not legible. Legibility of the image depends on the original text size, and Bloomberg is not

concerned about whether or not the image includes readable text. Bloomberg is instead concerned with generating an iconic image of a document for document image management applications. Col. 5, line 63 — col. 6, line 11. Thus, Bloomberg does not disclose selecting an image *from* a target page, as defined by claims 50 and 60.

Failing to disclose every element of independent claims 50 and 60, the combination of Weinberg and Bloomberg fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Claims 50 and 60 are therefore patentable. The remaining claims are also patentable, at least as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 51

Weinberg & Bloomberg Fail To Disclose *Defining Identifiers and Properties For Each Selected Object In The Map Information*

In Applicants' last response, specific deficiencies of Weinberg were pointed out with respect to claim 51. Applicants therefore did <u>not</u> rely on a general allegation of patentability, contrary to what is stated in the Final Action. However, in the "Response to Arguments" at page 11, it was clarified that the phrases "Mercury Interactive," etc., are being relied on as the claimed "identifier." This argument was not previously clear.

The Final Action also relies on "Mercury Interactive" as the claimed "block of text" that is automatically selected from target objects. Final Action, page 9 ("It remains completely unclear to the Examiner how phrases such as Mercury Interactive Online" and "Mercury Interactive – Empl . . " can possibly be interpreted in any other way than "blocks of text.") This is a contradictory position to what has now been adopted with respect to claim 51. The "block of text" as defined by claims 50 and 60 cannot be the same thing as the "identifier," because the block of text is automatically selected from target pages, while the identifier is defined – i.e., is the result of a different process. Therefore, if these text strings read on the claimed block of text, they cannot at the same time read on the claimed identifier, and vice versa. Applicants respectfully

request that the Examiner clarify which element – identifier or block of text – is being read on these apparent page titles.

Moreover, Weinberg fails to disclose *defining* the Mercury Interactive page titles. Apparently, the titles are taken from the web pages during a scanning process, and are therefore not defined by the host. Col. 9:27-35. At any rate, Weinberg fails to disclose or suggest any process for defining the page titles or other identifiers "for each selected object."

At least for the foregoing reason, Claim 51 is independently allowable.

Claims 68-69

Weinberg & Bloomberg Fail To Disclose *Cooperating With An Application Module Operating On A Client*

Weinberg fails to disclose or suggest "cooperating with an application module operating on a client computer, the application module configured for generating a map page from the map information provided by the host," as recited. Instead, Weinberg consistently discloses using a specialty application that scans target pages and reports on the host. *See, e.g.,* col. 7:55-8:15; 1:66-2:26. As pointed out in the Final Action, Weinberg characterizes the computer operating its software as a "client." This fact is not dispositive, because Weinberg lacks any disclosure of using a host device configured to generate the map information and to operate in cooperation with the so-called client. Therefore, the "client" application in Weinberg is not "configured for generating a map page from the map information provided by the host." Weinberg is designed for Webmaster use, and provides no suggestion or motivation to deliver and dispense information in the claimed manner, with or without using a distributable application.

At least for the foregoing reason, claims 68-69 are independently allowable.

<u>Claims 72-73</u>

Weinberg & Bloomberg Fail To Disclose *Automatically Selecting Target Pages From Search Query Results*

Weinberg fails to disclose or suggest "automatically selecting the plurality of target pages for generating map information using predetermined criteria applied to query results," as recited. Instead, Weinberg consistently discloses using a specialty application that scans target pages for a website. *See, e.g.,* col. 7:55-8:15; 1:66-2:26. Weinberg discloses a tool for use by Webmasters to better understand a Web site. As such, the target pages are defined by membership in the site.

Weinberg provides no suggestion or motivation to automatically select the target pages to be mapped using predetermined criteria applied to search query results. Automatice selection of target pages from query results should not be confused with providing a Web map for a site operating a search engine, as Weinberg discloses at 26:33-27:35. There, Weinberg discloses mapping a dynamically generated search result page, but expressly teaches against automatically selecting target pages from query results: "Astra does not automatically scan the children of the dynamically-generated Web page" (meaning the search result page). Col. 27:4-10. Base claim 60 requires map information to comprise information that is selected from the scanned web object, as might be obtained by scanning. In turn, target pages are those pages from which the map information is obtained. It is clear that Weinberg does not disclose automatically selecting target pages from search results, because, as noted above, "Astra does not automatically scan" the pages returned by a search query.

Nor does the fact that Weinberg teaches that any page can be manually selected for mapping (col. 1:64 – col. 2:48) amount to a disclosure of the claimed feature. Manual selection of a target page is, of course, distinct from automatic selection using predetermined criteria. Nor is any other reference cited as disclosing automatic selection of target pages from search query results. This feature has not been shown

disclosed in any reference, and therefore no valid *prima facie* case has been made against claims 72 and 73.

At least for the foregoing reason, claims 72-73 are independently allowable.

Claims 54, 57, 63 & 66

Weinberg, Bloomberg & Astiz Fail To Disclose *Serving The Map Page In Response To Selection Of An Associated Identifier*

The deficiencies of Weinberg and Bloomberg with respect to the base claims 50 and 60 are acknowledged, as discussed above in connection with the base claims. The Office Action further acknowledges the deficiencies of Bloomberg and Weinberg with respect to dependent claims 54, 57, 63 and 66. Astiz does not make up for these deficiencies. Astiz is cited for disclosing storing map information in a database, and for use of a mouse to access a web map. Col. 9:31 – 10:50. Astiz fails to disclose or suggest "serving the map page in response to selection of an associated identifier," as defined by claims 54 & 63. Instead, Astiz discloses:

> the map maker 14 generates a map icon which is automatically displayed by browser 12 whenever the user is browsing that web site. A user displays the web site map by clicking for example on that map icon displayed on the browser display screen.

Col. 9:34-38. This map icon, however is <u>not</u> an identifier because it is not unique to the map page; it just indicates a map-generation command for the current web site, much like a "print" icon indicates a link to print the current document. Astiz therefore does not read on claim 54, which requires that a map be served in response to selection of its identifier.

Astiz also discloses:

> [t]o go directly to a map entry such as an HTML page, the user simply selects a map entry, e.g., clicks his mouse while pointing to one of the

> entries in the displayed navigational web site map. In response, the map
> viewer 18 and browser 12 retrieve the specified HTML page.

Col. 10:45-49. This differs from what is claimed, because the "map entry" of Astiz does not link to a map of the indicated page. Instead, the map entry links to the page itself, just as an ordinary hyperlink. While opening a web page by selecting a link to it may have been "notoriously well known in the art," and is disclosed by Astiz, the novel step of serving a map instead of the web page was apparently not known at all, and may be said to obtain an unexpected result. Astiz therefore does not make up for the deficiencies of Weinberg and Bloomberg in failing to disclose "serving the map page in response to selection of an associated identifier."

Similar considerations apply to claims 57 and 66, which further define operation of a hyperlink as a way to access a map of a related page. This is not disclosed by Astiz. As noted above, Astiz discloses using a hyperlink to access the page itself, but not to access a map of the page. When a page is being viewed, Astiz would provide a map in response to selection of a "map" icon or command. Astiz therefore discloses a fundamentally different scheme for delivering Web maps.

Accordingly, claims 54, 57, 63 and 66 are independently allowable.

* * *

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 50-54, 56-63, 65-69 and 72-73 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. If it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicant encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

While no fees are believed due in connection with this response, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-3683.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 22, 2007   __/Jonathan Jaech/_____

Jonathan Jaech
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,091

CUSTOMER
NUMBER

58688
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, DE 19899
(213) 787-2500

12324.1